

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1927

WHOLE No. 547



## A Record of Achievement!

*Send for this 20-page booklet*

which reveals the signal success achieved by these two books in the year and a half since their publication. The lists of introductions are a convincing record, testifying to the popularity of these notable books.

### ELEMENTARY LATIN SECOND LATIN BOOK

*For Junior and Senior High Schools*

By B. L. Ullman and Norman E. Henry

*"Compact, complete, interesting, scholarly, teachable".*

Elementary Latin \$1.40

Second Latin Book \$1.68

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

## Harkness, Kirtland and Williams' Cicero

Edited by ALBERT HARKNESS, Ph.D., LL.D., J. C. KIRTLAND, Professor in Phillips Exeter Academy, and G. A. WILLIAMS, Ph.D., Professor in Kalamazoo College. With notes, vocabulary, and illustrations.

**Nine Orations and the Impeachment of Verres.** 568 pages. \$1.72

**Six Orations.** 466 pages. \$1.40

**The Impeachment of Verres (Wightman).** \$0.16

This edition has been published in two forms. The larger volume includes the four orations against *Catiline*, the orations for the *Manilian Law*, for the poet *Archias*, for *Marcellus* and for *Ligarius*, the *Fourteenth Philippic*, and the *Impeachment of Verres*.

The smaller volume contains the first six of these orations. The Introduction gives an outline of the life of Cicero, Roman oratory, and the public life and government of the Romans. The vocabulary contains both primary meanings and special meanings.

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON ATLANTA

---

## A Teacher of Latin who knew what she wanted expresses an opinion on

### D'OOGHE AND ROEHM'S JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS

"I like the short vocabularies, the constant repetition of words and constructions in the translation exercises; the drill that is given each new case and each new construction before other work is presented; the presentation of a number of new constructions before the second declension is taught. I like especially the many paragraphs of connected reading. My pupils were delighted when they found they could translate a real story. Each new reading lesson gives them pleasure, and is helping to build a good reading foundation. The illustrations and the paragraphs in English are especially helpful".—Ada G. Finegan, *Nathaniel Hawthorne School, Yonkers, New York.*

### GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1927

WHOLE No. 547

## MR. T. W. ALLEN ON HOMER

Homer: The Origins and the Transmission. By Thomas W. Allen. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch (1924). Pp. 357. \$6.00.

Mr. T. W. Allen's book, *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission*, is divided into two approximately equal parts. The first part deals with the origins, the second with the transmission, of the Homeric Poems.

The contents of the book are as follows:

Preface (5-7); A. Origins (11-201): I. Lives of Homer (11-41), II. The Homeridae (42-50), III. Epic Cycle and Homeric Hymns (51-77), IV. The Date of Hesiod (78-97), V. Language (98-109), VI. Argos, Danai, Achaei (110-129), VII. Dictys of Crete: The Heroic Chronicle (130-176), VIII. Scheme of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (177-201); B. Transmission (202-327): IX. Additions to the Poems (202-224), X. Pisistratus and Homer (225-248), XI. Early Quotations (249-270), XII. Editions Current 300 B. C.: Papyri (271-301), XIII. Origin of the Vulgate (302-327); Appendix: Corrections and Additions to *The Homeric Catalogue*, Oxford, 1921 (328-350); Index (351-357).

The chapters are, in general, articles which had appeared in classical journals. These are now revised and augmented. This fact may account for some apparent shortcomings in the book. It is a good book, and yet, if Mr. Allen had laid aside his articles and had written with a free hand, he might have made a very much better book, in fact, even a fascinating book.

Another difficulty is in the use indifferently, in the same sense, of Greek terms or their English translations. For example, we find "ethos" on page 179, *ἦθος* on page 188, and both on page 198. Words or expressions like "Ionicization" (109), "Aristarchus' inefficacy" (327), "It had to be looked for in the critic in questions' *ὁρθότητα*..." (308) will certainly strike the unlearned reader as strange. A sentence on page 179, "We cannot suppose in the chronicle the deliberate intervention of the Olympians invoked to account for the removal of each Trojan prince", will have to be read more than once by most people before its meaning will penetrate. The statement on page 208 that "Ἰλυσ is unhomeric" should of course be modified by adding the words 'in this sense'. If an instructor in English should find in a Sophomore theme these words (200), "Secondly, the story contains divine intervention throughout, and if we include minor divinities at every point," there is little doubt that he would write in the margin, 'Add two commas or rewrite'. On page 168 occurs this sentence: "... It is much more likely that Dictys' source preserved the original and natural (for it is only in the *Odyssey* that the chronological order is disturbed: the *Iliad* and Cycle narrate events as they occurred) order..." Surely none of the Germans, whose methods Mr. Allen flays so

soundly in his book, would inflict a more dreadful sentence on a patient reader.

Finally, the Index is so pitifully inadequate that the vast learning and information which the book contains is made inaccessible for reference. In this field, at least, the much berated Germans do better.

In the earlier half of the book, Mr. Allen's avowed intention is to set the date of Homer as far back as it can be put by using the evidence of Greek tradition. To this end, he begins, in Chapter I, with an analysis and comparison of the extant 'Lives' of Homer, including also the Certamen of Homer and Hesiod, all of which he himself has edited and printed in the fifth volume of the Oxford Homer. Two useful tables, comparing side by side the different Lives, are given; one of these is so large that it has to be inserted on a folding sheet. Record of mention of Homer by later writers carries tradition of Homer back to the middle of the sixth century. At the end, the author leads up to his second chapter by suggesting (38) that this tradition originated with a "gild" known as the Sons of Homer, or Homeridae, a Chian "gild", according to the logographi of the fifth century. This "gild" consisted of the descendants of the poet who had an hereditary right to recite the poems of their ancestor (47). As Mr. Allen says (50),

The Homeridae, therefore, take us to Chios and to a Homer living there. But as to date all we can yet say is 'earlier than Acusilaus', which means the sixth century, the epoch at which we arrived in ch. i.

In treating the Epic Cycle and the Homeric Hymns Mr. Allen first vindicates Proclus and his Chrestomathy, and proves pretty conclusively from the evidence of papyri that Proclus had access to the literature which he quotes or summarizes. Mr. Allen proceeds then to set down in order whatever evidence is now in existence regarding the contents and the authorship of the poems of the Cycle. This presentation is followed by a brief account of the Hymns. Mr. Allen's conclusion is as follows (64-65):

Accordingly, on the question of date the Cycle takes us from 753 B. C. (Antimachus of Teos) and 744 (Arctinus) to the middle of the sixth century. The earlier poets are Ionian or Lesbian; in the seventh and sixth centuries the Muse visited the old world and the African colony....

Later, Mr. Allen writes thus (75):

We conclude that a survey of the contents of the Cyclic poems shows that they can only be explained on the supposition that they filled up the portions of the *Tale of Troy* that had not already been told in epic form; and since these portions have always been attributed to Homer, that the Cyclic poets, Homer's disciples, appropriated as much of the *Tale of Troy* as their master had left.

Again, on pages 76-77, Mr. Allen makes this statement:

...Homer does not let his world show through. . . . This is one difference between Homer and his disciples. Religion, it is admitted, is another. The convention which limited Homer's picture of religion had ceased to be valid. For these changes time is necessary. How much time we do not know.

In the chapter on The Date of Hesiod Mr. Allen puts Hesiod *circa* 800 B. C., on the evidence of tradition and of an elaborate astronomical calculation regarding Hesiod, Works and Days 564-567. Before speaking of the language of Homer Mr. Allen sums up his results as follows (98):

Traditional evidence, the evidence given explicitly in documents or which may be inferred from them, comes to this, that the school of Homer was at work in the middle of the eighth century, and Hesiod, who appears, though not certainly, to imply Homer, fifty years before. Up to 800 we may say that Homer is referred to and taken for granted, but not seen. To get beyond this period, if indeed we can, we must try other evidence, and, first, that of language.

He then essays to prove that Homer's language shows that he was a native of Chios. The inscriptions of Chios are very meager, and Mr. Allen takes as his evidence the single inscription containing Aeolic forms, which may be found in C. D. Buck, Greek Dialects, No. 4 (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1910), or in E. S. Roberts, An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, Part I, No. 149 (Cambridge University Press, 1887), or in O. Hoffmann, Die Griechische Dialekte in ihren Historischen Zusammenhänge mit den Wichtigsten ihrer Quellen Dargestellt, 3, page 40, No. 80 (Göttingen, 1898), or Collitz-Bechtel, Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften 5653 (Göttingen, 1884-1915). He might have found a few more shreds of evidence in Buck, Greek Dialects, page 131, § 184. But one inscription containing Aeolic forms among others containing only Ionic forms is not a very substantial foundation on which to erect a very large structural theory. Professor J. A. Scott, in The Unity of Homer of Homer, 6-7 (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.212-214), with equal vigor set forth a fishy argument, in which he held that Smyrna must have been the birthplace of Homer. When the high priests disagree among themselves, what shall the humble worshipers do?

Chapter VI embodies an attempt to go beyond the evidence of the language of Homer, and to determine the meanings of the words *Argos*, *Achaei*, and *Danai*. Mr. Allen establishes *argos* in the meaning of 'plain' or 'mainland', and then goes on to say (115):

...I assume then that the Cretans who conquered the Greek mainland were *Ἀχαιοί*. There would be two *Ἀχαιοί*, the original (or relatively original, they may have made Crete a steppingstone between Asia and Greece), and the mainland *Ἀχαιοί*. The latter called themselves *ἀργεῖοι*, 'continentals', from their new country the *ἀργος*, or mainland.

There follow a listing and a discussion of the uses and meaning of the three words in question, and of 'Pelagian' also, but it is difficult to criticize the results, since there seem to be no results, save that the

words have different meanings in different places, as is well known.

Chapter VII opens with the following words (130):

What went before Homer? What preceded the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*? No one now imagines that they are the result of their author's creative art, like a statue or a symphony—especially at a moment of criticism when the individual is decried and crowd-psychology regards human productions as growths or common efforts. The answers given to this question have rested on nothing better than the analysis of the poems, a method proved futile and one may hope discredited by its results. . . .

Besides the usual tradition and references in the poems themselves Mr. Allen offers a comparative study of Dictys of Crete and his Ephemeris, which, backed by some other evidence, shows, he contends, the existence of an anterior Heroic Chronicle, which in many points coincides with the Cycle, but shows striking discrepancies with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The story of Dictys is compared in detail with the Cycle and the Homeric Poems. Dictys, as Mr. Allen says, has acquired a little better standing in recent years owing to the discovery, in 1907, of a fragment of the Greek original of his story of the Trojan War (Tehtunis Papyri, Volume 2, No. 268).

With the hypothesis of the Heroic Chronicle thus established, Mr. Allen can go on to the next chapter and show how Homer changed and adapted his material to suit his poetic purposes. At this the Homeric Unitarian will scoff, the anti-Unitarian will remain to adore. This sort of *σκιμαχία* has come to be a well recognized indoor sport, but it is sadly in need of restriction by means of rules and an umpire. The rules will forbid the introduction of statements like this (184): "Accordingly in *B* the earlier half is invention, with incidents taken from other places. As the episode never occurred, Thersites' display cannot have really taken place at this point. . . ." By the same reasoning, in Shakespeare's lines, "Even at the base of Pompey's statue <sic> Which all the while ran blood great Caesar fell", the display cannot really have taken place at this point, since the Chronicle shows that the statue did not run blood, but was merely sprinkled with Caesar's blood!

If we ask ourselves soberly what we have gained from Mr. Allen's careful and conscientious work in the earlier half of his book, we shall have to reply, 'Not very much'. True, he has assembled and weighed for us the traditions regarding Homer and the Sons of Homer, the Epic Cycle, and Hesiod; but do we really know anything more about Homer than we did before? Tradition, as we see, places him as far back as the tenth century, but is that far enough? Far enough, perhaps, for this particular epic poet, supreme in his way; but was he the original epic poet? Clearly not, as he himself testifies; and the origin of epic poetry is to be sought in earlier times, of which at present we have no knowledge except such as is afforded by archaeology. It seems inconceivable that the great kings of the palace epoch in Crete and of the mainland should not have had their literature and their poets; it is there, it seems, that we should look for the origin of epic poetry. Whether we shall ever be vouchsafed a glimpse of those



distant times through the medium of a literary record is a question to which no answer is at present forthcoming; yet in recent years so many things have been discovered whose discovery was hardly even dreamed of, that what seems to-day an impossibility may before many years prove possible.

The second half of Mr. Allen's book deals with the manuscript tradition of the Homeric Poems, a more circumscribed subject, one with which the author must be thoroughly familiar, since he has edited, for the Oxford Press, all these poems and the Hymns. Yet, as one reads the carefully prepared selection of examples, and agrees with most of the conclusions, one cannot help feeling that there are certain things which Mr. Allen has left unsaid and unsung. He might have vouchsafed a word—even an enthusiastic word—about some of Bentley's brilliant emendations, confirmed only in recent years by papyri, but Mr. Allen shows no disposition to go behind the returns—in fact, sometimes he seems loath even to accept the returns. For example, he has this (288): "Ω 192: . . ἡ δὲ Μασσαλιωτικὴ πολλὰ κεκαύθει A = ἐνίοι T, om. B. κεκαύθει codd." He says not a word about Fick, and not even a word about Papyrus 13! In the Oxford edition of the text of Homer we find this footnote: "192 κεκαύθει Ar. vulg.: κεκαύθη P<sup>13</sup> m. sec. I B C L<sup>13</sup> V<sup>1</sup> V<sup>2</sup> V<sup>30</sup>: [ . . ] οὐδὲ P<sup>13</sup>: κεκαύθει Mass." Yet there can be no reasonable doubt that κεκαύθει (or ἐκεκαύθει, as Van Leeuwen writes it, with the support of the Scholiast) is the true reading. One has no right to ignore the results of comparative and historical grammar, even if some of these were made in Germany. Mr. Allen does read πέπασθε (Il. 3.99, and elsewhere), but πέπασθε: [πέπασθεν] = πέπασθε: κέχοντα (of course Ludwig reads κεκαύθει and πέπασθε, as might be expected from a man who will let his prejudice control his judgment). But, in justice to Mr. Allen, it should perhaps be said that his main purpose in the second part of his book is to try to determine the extent of the Corpus Homericum in existence at different times in antiquity. On this matter he has a right to speak with some authority.

The second part of the book opens (Chapter IX) with an account of additions made to the Homeric Poems from various sources: Hesiod, the Cycle, the Hymns, in classical times, in Alexandrian times, and in post-Alexandrian times. Many of these are not additions, but really alterations or variant readings, often only the substitution of another word or another form. To the influence of Hesiodic literature Mr. Allen attributes 24 variations attested here and there, to the Cycle 2, to the Hymns 14. In the sixth century, he finds, only 8 variants strove for recognition. Of these only one ever gained any social standing. Variants coming from the fifth century are 52, from Alexandrian times 37, and from post-Alexandrian 25. Mr. Allen's conclusion in brief is this (217):

... In other words deliberate augmentation of the text, or material alteration of its meaning, ceased after the eighth and seventh centuries; succeeding changes were limited, with a few exceptions, to vocabulary and forms of words. Moreover, as in most of the recorded cases of addition we can trace the additions to

literature, it follows that there is considerable probability that additions were due to the effect of literature, mostly epic literature....

In all this it is certain that there are two elements of uncertainty: (1) the ridiculously small number of variants attributed to the Cycle, which would no doubt be multiplied greatly if we had appreciable remains of the Cycle for comparison, and (2) the difficulty in assigning some of the variants with surety to a particular age or author. Thus, e. g., *καυδέσσας* (for *κηρώσσας*, Od. 4.1) is assigned by Mr. Allen to Zenodotus, but several intelligent editors would assign it to Homer himself! The rest of this chapter deals with interpolation in the Odyssey. Mr. Allen sums up as follows (224):

Accordingly ψ 267 -ω will have been composed between the sixth-century *Telegonia* which followed them and the *Thesprotis* of Musaeus, which implies the Corinthian colonization as made or coming. Such a period allows for the inferiority of the books which strikes critics generally....

All this is respectfully referred to Professor John A. Scott.

In Chapter X, the author takes up the tradition that Pisistratus collected or edited the Homeric Poems. After quoting and examining the evidence he rejects the tradition *in toto*. It is interesting to compare a paper, Pisistratus and his Edition of Homer, in the Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences 43.489-510, in which Mr. Samuel Hart Newhall quotes the same evidence and reaches just the opposite conclusion.

In Chapter XI Mr. Allen deals with the quotations of Homer in later Greek (and Latin) writers. Ludwig has examined and collated these down to about the Christian era, but Mr. Allen examines also Strabo, Plutarch, Pausanias, and Athenaeus. His general conclusion he states as follows (267):

The evidence which the quotations furnish for the Homeric text in general is most valuable and interesting; but when it is brought to bear on the question of the existence of longer, medium, and shorter texts—which is all we consider here—this evidence is very limited in affording conclusions and differs essentially according to century. In the earlier centuries it is affected by the imperfect discrimination between Homer and the Cycle (and other epic literature): in the later by the frequent possibility that the quotation in a given author may be taken from the author's source.

With this general conclusion one may well agree, and it is perhaps unkind to call attention to the method and argument used on a single page (251) in the effort to prove that Aristophanes accepted the Cycle and the Hymns as Homeric. Mr. Allen writes:

... <Aristophanes, Peace> 1269 sqq. Lamachus' child repeats hexameter verses without author's name; 1269 is identified by the scholiast with the first line of the *Epigoni* (this shows that Aristophanes <*sic*> shared Thucydides' opinion of the Homeric canon).... *Birds* 575 *ἴσιν δὲ γ' Ὀμηρος ἔφασκέ* *λεῖλην εἶναι τρήρωνι πέλει* is only true of h. Apoll. 114, as the scholiast saw.

So from Aristophanes we gather that he admitted as Homeric the Cycle and the Hymns, as the fifth century did....

Now the scholiast is not Aristophanes, and identification of the verse in the Peace by the scholiast does not give the scholiast any warrant to speak for Aristophanes, who cannot be trusted, any more than Bernard Shaw can, to get anything straight if it suits his purpose to give it a twist. What the scholiast says on Birds 575 is this:

ψεύδεται παίζων. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἰριδος ἀλλ' ἐπὶ Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἥρας <Il. 5.778> αἱ δὲ βάνη τρήρωσι πελειάσιν ἰσμοῖσι. οἱ δὲ ἐν ἐτέροις ποιήμασιν Ὀμήρου υφασί τοῦτο φέρεσθαι. εἰσι γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔμνοι.

If the scholiast on the Peace is authoritative, so must be the scholiast here when he says, in effect, that Aristophanes is here setting the example so often followed by Bernard Shaw (ψεύδεται παίζων), but that other less appreciative critics, like Mr. Allen, would refer this to the Hymns. Most likely the scholiast is right, for the words in the Hymn to Apollo 114 βάνη δὲ ποσὶ τρήρωσι πελειάσιν . . . ἰσμοῖσι are too pedestrian to fit the argument of Aristophanes, who is talking about the similarity between the Gods and the Birds in that they both have wings. Probably Aristophanes did not always verify his references, but, if Mr. Allen assumes that he did, then some mention should have been made of Bentley's simple emendation (adopted by many editors), which changes Ἰριν to Ἥρην, and thus makes the reference unequivocal. Surely there is no evidence here to warrant the statement that Aristophanes "admitted as Homeric the Cycle and the Hymns".

Chapter XII, in many ways one of the most interesting in the book, deals with the different editions of Homer current in the third century B. C., and the evidence of the papyri concerning such editions. Mr. Allen puts the case clearly at the beginning (271):

...Our source . . . is the Homeric scholia . . . with sporadic notices in general literature. The readings mentioned by the scholiasts fall into three classes: (a) those favoured by men of letters (e. g. Antimachus, Callisthenes) and grammarians, and adopted in their editions. . . (b) those of the editions called κατὰ πόλεις or πολιτικά, (c) those of an edition going by the name of κοινή and equivalent titles. This information has long been common property, and little, even from papyri, can be added to it.

Mr. Allen then assembles the evidence under these three heads in an orderly way, after which he gives the evidence of the papyri. It is all too detailed to quote or to summarize, and the main results are embodied in the next chapter.

If one may speak again of isolated matters, the evidence of the manuscripts and of the scholia on Iliad 24. 344 is as follows (275): "οὕτως ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τοῦ ε. αἱ δὲ κοινὰ διὰ τοῦ η̄ ἰσμοῖσι A, om. B T. ἰσμοῖσι vulg.: ἰσμοῖσι p 9 A C Bm 4 Bm 6 M 9 O 2". The editors, like the MSS., differ in their views. Some print the subjunctive, some the indicative. Yet there are three considerations in favor of the subjunctive, none in favor of the indicative. The clause is a generalizing clause; -ῃ tends to become -αι; and the absence of αἱ would in later times make the subjunctive seem abnormal to prosaic minds, and so motivate the change to the indicative. It is a fair question, then, whether

this does not belong in the same class as μάλιστα δ' ἔμοι, Il. 6.493, in being surely the true reading.

On page 296 Mr. Allen says: "...Il. 59 <Il. 16. 59> (Mass.) is not clear. § 454 <Il. 20.454> is mysterious". The reviewer is inclined to think that Il. 16.59 is quite clear, and that Il. 20.454 is not altogether mysterious. On Il. 16.59 the comment is as follows (285): "ἐν τῇ Μασσαλιωτικῇ καὶ τῇ Ῥιανῷ μεταναστεῖν <for μεταναστῖν>, καὶ ἀκούουσι τὴν βρισηίδα T (ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος γὰρ φεῖ μεταναστὴν καὶ πρὸς τὴν βρισηίδα ἀκούει β) om. A μετανάστην codd." This really means that the pronoun μοι referring to Achilles is so far away that μετανάστην was taken as referring to Briseis, who is passed about as an alien possessing no rights. Two of the official copies, therefore, read μεταναστῖν feminine (compare εὐέργειν in a late Aeolic inscription, given in Collitz-Bechtel, Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, 1, No. 224): i. e. εὐέργειν; εὐέργειν = μετανάστην; μεταναστῖν. This offended Aristarchus's grammatical soul (he would have preferred μεταναστῖδα); so he chose to keep the masculine form, but still to refer it to Briseis, a further confirmation of Mr. Allen's reiterated statement that the Alexandrian grammarians were often lacking in knowledge and in critical acumen, since in Il. 8.648, where the line is also found, the application to Achilles is unmistakable.

Mr. Allen's statement regarding Il. 21.454 is as follows (287): "οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος τηλεδαπῶν. αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων θηλυτέρων AT, om. B. τηλεδαπῶν codd". Presumably the original reading (which would have rejoiced Pick's heart, if only he had thought of it) was πηλυτέρων (compare πῆλυ in Aeolic), and some of the official copies corrected this into a more familiar (but here a meaningless) adjective, while Aristarchus merely substituted the stock word, which, being intelligible, was received into the texts.

That Aristarchus and the Alexandrian scholars had really very little influence upon the present text of Homer Mr. Allen tries to show in his last chapter, with some reference to two later parallels in the tradition of Hippocrates's text as found in Galen, and that of the Greek Old Testament as found in Origen's Hexapla. Mr. Allen's final conclusions may perhaps best be set down in his own words (324): "Long texts of Homer were abundant in the fourth century at Athens, and in the third and second in Egypt. They died in the first. . .". The conditions influencing the book trade were two (324-325): (a) "the Hellenization of Rome, the establishment of a new focus of education and literature in the West. . .", and (b) "the decay of the rhapsodic art. . .". On page 327 we read,

...This consideration throws its weight into the balance of the fourth-century quotations against that of the third-century papyri, compels us to regard their evidence as accidental, and revives the view of Arthur Ludwich, that the Homeric vulgate was in existence before the Alexandrian period. . .

The Appendix contains corrections and additions to Mr. Allen's book, The Homeric Catalogue of Ships (for a review of this book, by Mr. A. Shewan, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.20-23).

It is interesting to compare the progress of philology

and archaeology during the last fifty years as regards Homer.

It is amusing now, of course, to read the controversial articles over the site of Troy and similar topics, for the spade has spoken regarding many of these questions. For a space of twenty-five years or thereabouts one discovery followed another, and we thought we had reached the end. With this compact body of fact at hand, not subject presumably to further amplifications, it was possible to write books like Reichel's *Homerische Waffen* which should be the last word on the application of knowledge gained from Mycenaeanology to illustrate the Homeric Poems. Then followed the astounding discoveries in Crete, and the 'Aegean' and 'Helladic' civilizations, and a new chapter began, not as yet closed.

In philology there has been no sudden drawing aside of the curtain. Progress has been slow, and not always sure, for the leaders, or some of them, have not infrequently rushed aside in pursuit of some *ignis fatuus* which they mistook for a true guiding-star, with the natural result that a large part of their labor on Homer was but wasted. Fick, Robert, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, ἀφραδέειν . . . βροτῶν εἶδωλα καμόντων! On the other hand, there is a long list of devoted scholars from Bentley to Van Leeuwen and Allen, whose labors have perceptibly furthered our knowledge of the text of Homer, but, after all, they are somewhat in the position of men on the shore of a fog-covered lake, poking about with sticks in the muddy water, and discovering now one little thing, now another, though occasionally one of them, like Van Leeuwen, runs and gets a longer stick and pulls in something which the rest have not been able to reach, or another of them, like Fick, gazes intently for a long, long time into the fog, and then tells the others that he is sure he can see an Aeolian island floating majestically on the calm water, and on the island the very cradle in which the infant Homer was laid at his birth. Perhaps these are all there, but just now the fog is too dense for the others to see them. But, if in philology, as in archaeology, there should be a sudden burst of sunlight, and on the Phaistos Disk, for example, should be found a few lines of dactylic hexameter such as Homer wrote, the fog would lift, and we could see the lake and its surroundings in clearer light. Is this impossible? Stranger things have happened.

TRINITY COLLEGE,  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

FRANK COLE BABBITT

### ON IMITATION AND ORIGINALITY

The following clipping from the New York World of January 13, 1927 invites comment on a fundamental difference between an ancient and a modern educational viewpoint. The notice is from a London correspondent.

A. Hattemore, plumber-artist, whose work has been bought for the Tate Gallery, refused to visit the National Gallery and has only been in the Tate Gallery once to see his own work on exhibition there.

"I am afraid that I might be led to imitate if I

looked at too much of the work of artists at this stage in my artistic education", he declared.

Hattemore is engaged most of the time repairing water mains. The picture by him, which has attracted greatest attention, is of the parlor in his home at Hackney.

The avoidance of all interference with self-expression is one of the most cherished of our current educational ideals, and runs directly counter to a principle taken for granted in antiquity. One of the chief steps in Roman education, at least in the training of the orator, was the study and imitation of eminent models (Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.88-90). Tacitus's vigorous complaint (*Dialogus* 34-35) that this practice had gone out of style since Cicero's day does not indicate a radical change in methods of teaching, as may be gathered from the advice of Quintilian (2.2.8) that the teacher's *declamatio* be so carefully done as to constitute a model for his students. In other words, imitation was still the principle, but the exemplar, instead of being the work of the man of affairs or the statesman, became that of the professional teacher. Quintilian points out further (10.2.1-3) the effectiveness of imitation in acquiring a fluent mastery of style (*firma facilitas*, 10.1.1), and especially cites imitation of literary models as the most helpful method.

That the Romans felt no misgivings at all about 'submerging their individualities' in the works of famous predecessors needs no demonstration here. Compare Horace's oft-quoted direction (*Ars Poetica* 268-269): *Vos exemplaria Graeca nocturna versate manu, versate diurna*. It is obvious that he takes for granted *some* form of imitation, and the only question in his mind is the selection of the model. Despite his ardent championship of the 'moderns' as opposed to the ancients, it is noteworthy that he finds these models not in contemporary Romans, but in classic Greeks<sup>3</sup>. So too Longinus is convinced of the value of imitation and cites great names as evidence of the practice and as models for the prospective author (13-14<sup>3</sup>):

... there is also another road, besides all that we have mentioned, which leads to the sublime. What, and what manner of road is that? Imitation and emulation

<sup>3</sup>In its worst form this attitude is expressed in an incident which has recently come to my notice, of the Sophomores in a High School in New York City protesting against the assignment of a theme based upon the style of an author whose works they had read, on the ground that they would thereby be compelled to submerge their individualities. In its best form the idea may be judged from a brilliant volume by my colleague, Professor Hughes Mearns, *Creative Youth* (New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1925), which gives the results, with most sympathetic comments, of an attempt to encourage original literary effort in a group of High School students. I hope my comments in the text above will not give the impression that I am passing judgment upon the modern method as opposed to the ancient. I am interested solely in pointing out that there is a difference, and that this difference is fundamental. The modern stress upon the study of children is assuredly an innovation deserving every encouragement, despite the misguided efforts of some of the sentimentalists attached to the movement.

<sup>4</sup>Even to the extent of advising what to 'expressionist' feelings would involve gross infidelity to ethical or esthetic standards, the free borrowing of subject-matter (*Ars Poetica* 309-311):

Scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons,  
Rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae,  
verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur.

The implication of this passage is that material is quite secondary. We may paraphrase Horace's thought thus (317-318): 'The prime requisite of an author is sanity, i. e. point of view; what he says, i. e. the subject-matter, he may get from one place or another—from ethical treatises, for instance, or from observation of life'.

<sup>5</sup>I use the translation by A. O. Prickard (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1906). See pages 30-32.



of great writers and poets who have been before us. Here is our mark, my friend, let us hold closely to it: for many are borne along inspired by a breath which comes from another. . . .

Was Herodotus alone 'most Homeric'? There was Stesichorus before him, and Archilochus; but, more than any, Plato drew into himself from that Homeric fountain countless runlets and channels of water. . . . Here is no theft, but such a rendering as is made from beautiful spectacles or from carvings or other works of art. I do not think that there would be such a bloom as we find on some of his philosophical dogmas, or that he could have entered so often into poetical matter and expressions, unless he had entered for the first place against Homer, aye, with all his soul, a young champion against one long approved; and striven for the mastery, too emulously perhaps and in the spirit of the lists, yet not without his reward; for 'good', says Hesiod, 'is this strife for mortals'. Yes, that contest for fame is fair, and its crown worthy of the winning, wherein even to be defeated by our forerunners is not inglorious.

Therefore even we, when we are working out a theme which requires lofty speech and greatness of thought, do well to imagine within ourselves how, if need were, Homer would have said this same thing, how Plato or Demosthenes, or, in history, Thucydides would have made it sublime. The figures of those great men will meet us on the way while we vie with them, they will stand out before our eyes, and lead our souls upwards towards the measure of the ideal which we have conjured up. Still more so if we add to our mental picture this; how would Homer, were he here, have listened to this phrase of mine? or Demosthenes? how would they have felt at this? Truly great is this competition, where we assume for our own words such a jury, such an audience, and pretend that before judges and witnesses of that heroic build we undergo a scrutiny of what we write.

In the light of this marked difference in point of view, I should like to call attention to two apposite passages. The first, by R. W. Livingstone<sup>4</sup>, embodies a much-needed warning against the dangers of 'self-expression':

Directness is also a protection against that literature of egotism which is the excess into which subjective poetry easily falls. Legitimate when kept within bounds, the habit of putting oneself into what one writes can become an offence, and from this offence English literature is not free. No one can complain because Milton or Wordsworth are less detached than Shakespeare or Sophocles; but the subjectivity of Byron or Carlyle is very different. Their subject is continually darkened by the shadow of their personality; it suffers a partial, at times a total, eclipse. Child Harold sees himself in all that he sees, projects himself into Belgium, Athens and Rome, and colours the bluest skies with the jaundiced hues of his temperament. This is almost equally true of Carlyle's pupils, Ruskin and Froude, and, among the moderns, of a swarm of minor poets and novelists, who display before the public the pageant of their indignant or bleeding hearts. Egotism is a fault of manners as much as of morals, and has its peculiar effect and its appropriate penalty. Its effect is to distract a man's attention from major to minor issues, from the large world to the small self; its penalty is that it wearies its audience, and the next generation, if not its own, dislikes the continual obtrusion of an element in which it has no interest. Hence oblivion, often unjust, is the punishment which the egotist suffers. Even our age, in-

terested as it is in personalities, has little time to spare for those of Byron or Carlyle; it is too busy with the characters of its own contemporaries to trouble about those of its predecessors. But no Greek writer is forgotten for this cause. Whatever their other offences, the Greeks are free from literary egotism. Directness turned their eyes to the external world, and taught them to see even themselves from without.

The second citation comes from a well-known essay by Stevenson<sup>5</sup>. Unfortunately the essay, although short, is too long to be quoted in its entirety here, but will prove well worth the reading to any one at all interested in the development of literary style.

Whenever I read a book or a passage that particularly pleased me, in which a thing was said or an effect rendered with propriety, in which there was either some conspicuous force or some happy distinction in the style, I must sit down at once and set myself to ape that quality. I was unsuccessful, and I knew it; and tried again, and was again unsuccessful and always unsuccessful; but at least in these vain bouts, I got some practice in rhythm, in harmony, in construction and the co-ordination of parts. I have thus played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt, to Lamb, to Wordsworth, to Sir Thomas Browne, to Defoe, to Hawthorne, to Montaigne, to Baudelaire and to Obermann. . . .

That, like it or not, is the way to learn to write; whether I have profited or not, that is the way. It was so Keats learned, and there was never a finer temperament for literature than Keats's; it was so, if we could trace it out, that all men have learned; and that is why a revival of letters is always accompanied or heralded by a cast back to earlier and fresher models. Perhaps I hear some one cry out: But this is not the way to be original! It is not; nor is there any way but to be born so. Nor yet, if you are born original, is there anything in this training that shall clip the wings of your originality. There can be none more original than Montaigne, neither could any be more unlike Cicero; yet no craftsman can fail to see how much the one must have tried in his time to imitate the other. Burns is the very type of a prime force in letters: he was of all men the most imitative. Shakespeare himself, the imperial, proceeds directly from a school. It is only from a school that we can expect to have good writers; it is almost invariably from a school that great writers, these lawless exceptions, issue. Nor is there anything that should astonish the considerate. Before he can tell what cadences he truly prefers, the student should have tried all that are possible; before he can choose and preserve a fitting key of words, he should long have practised the literary scales; and it is only after years of such gymnastic that he can sit down at last, legions of words swarming to his call, dozens of turns of phrase simultaneously bidding for his choice, and he himself knowing what he wants to do and (within the narrow limit of a man's ability) able to do it.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE, CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

### HORACE, CARMINA 2.6. 9-14 AGAIN<sup>1</sup>

In connection with Professor Knapp's comments on Horace, Carmina 2.6.9-14, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.91-93, the following note may be of interest. Mr.

<sup>1</sup>A College Magazine, in *Memories and Portraits*, 59, 61-63 (New York, Scribner, 1895).

<sup>2</sup>Professor Ben C. Clough, of Brown University, had been good enough to call my attention to Mr. Douglas's book, *In Old Calabria* (London, Secker, 1915), especially to Chapters V and VII. The Land of Horace, and The Bandusian Point. Before I could get a copy of the book, Professor Coffin's note arrived. Professor Clough also mentioned Mr. Douglas's *Siren Land* (London, Dent 1921), as containing chapters on Sirens and Their Ancestry, Tiberius, and The Headland of Minerva. C. K. >

<sup>4</sup>In an essay entitled *Literature*, contributed to *The Legacy of Greece*, 275-276 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924). See, in the same volume, pages 161-162, an interesting passage with citation of Aristotle and Johnson.



Norman Douglas, in his book *Old Calabria*<sup>3</sup>, says (80):

A mile or so before reaching Taranto the railway crosses a stream that flows into the inland sea. One would be glad to believe those sages who hold it to be the far-famed Galaesus. It rises near at hand in a marsh, amid mighty tufts of reeds and odorous flowers, and the liquid bubbles up in pools of crystalline transparency—deep and perfidious cauldrons overhung by the trembling soil on which you stand. These fountains form a respectable stream some four hundred yards in length; another copious spring rises up in the sea near its mouth. But can this be the river whose virtues are extolled by: Virgil, Horace, Martial, Statius, Propertius, Strabo, Pliny, Varro and Columella? What a constellation of names around these short-lived waters! Truly, *minuit praesentia famam*, as Boccaccio says of the once-renowned Sebethus.

Often have I visited this site and tried to reconstruct its vanished glories. My enthusiasm even led me, some years ago, to the town hall, in order to ascertain its true official name, and here they informed me that "it is vulgarly called Citrezze; but the correct version is 'Le Giadrezze', which, as you are aware, sir, signifies *pleasantness*". This functionary was evidently ignorant of the fact that so long ago as 1771 the learned commentator (Carducci) of the "Delizie Tarentine" already sneered at this popular etymology; adding, what is of greater interest, that "in the time of our fathers" this region was covered with woods and rich in game. In the days of Keppel Craven, the vale was "scantily cultivated with cotton". Looking at it from above, it certainly resembles an old river-bed of about five hundred yards in breadth, and I hold it possible that the deforestation of the higher lands may have suffocated the original sources with soil carried down from thence, and forced them to seek a lower level, thus shortening the stream and reducing its volume of water.

But who shall decide? If we follow Polybius, another brook at the further end of the inland sea has more valid claims to the title of Galaesus. Virgil called it "black Galaesus"—a curious epithet, still applied to water in Italy as well as in Greece (Mavromati, etc.). "For me", says Gissing, "the Galaesus is the stream I found and tracked, whose waters I heard mingle with the little sea". There is something to be said for such an attitude, on the part of a dilettante traveller, towards these desperate antiquarian controversies.

It might be observed also that Mr. Douglas has some remarks on the Museum and Public Library of Taranto (88-89).

UNION COLLEGE

HARRISON C. COFFIN

#### CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

##### VI

Language—June, Stress Pronunciation in Latin, Mark H. Liddell; Review, favorable, except as to the part of the book dealing with etymology, by G. M. Bolling, of Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, new edition, Part I, under the supervision of H. Stuart Jones and others; Review, favorable, by G. M. Bolling, of Edgar Lobel, *The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Sappho*.

Professor Liddell's paper is especially important.

For the classical period he sums up thus (112-113): We are therefore safe in concluding that whatever the changes which Indo-European stress had wrought in the fabric of early Latin, the language of Rome in

the first century B. C. had settled down to a condition in which its words were distinguished primarily by their syllable-length successions, with a concomitant distinction of the syllable group by a rising pitch upon its penultimate or ante-penultimate unit according as the former was long or short, and a falling pitch on the other syllables. And since a rising pitch necessarily requires somewhat more energy than does a falling pitch, the *acutus* would serve to identify a particular syllable of a word as effectively as did the Indo-European stress without exposing the other syllables to the shifting of length and quality which a cumulative stress inevitably involves. The relative constancy of Latin syllable length from Ennius' time to Quintilian's, a period of some three centuries, is certainly a remarkable phenomenon.

September, *A Century of Grimm's Law*, Hermann Collitz; On Some Animal Names in Italic, Roland G. Kent [discussions of the etymology of the Latin words *aper*, *anser*, *aries*, *canis*, *lupus*, *volpes*, *bos*, *agna*]; Review, favorable, by R. G. Kent, of Edgar H. Sturtevant, *T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria*, Edited, With an Introduction and Notes.—December, *The Inscription of Duenos*, R. G. Kent [a discussion of the famous inscription on the triple jar. The paper was inspired by a recent work, E. Goldmann, *Die Duenos-Inschrift*, published by Winter, Heidelberg, 1926. This, says Professor Kent, was the forty-first attempt at interpretation of the inscription. Professor Kent himself regards the inscription as a curse, on a living person. In his conclusion (221-222), he presents an "eclectic" text and version, "resting, save in some minor points, on the authority of previous scholars. . . ." He renders the inscription as follows:

'He who sends me, [implores] the gods Jove, Vejove, (and) Saturn, may the Maid <Proserpina> not be kind to thee; but [may she stand aloof] from thee, unless thou wishest to make thy peace with Ops Tuteria or by the help (with the intercession) of the Salutary (Maid). A good man, [Bennus,] made me as a present to the gods of Hell; to the good man may not evil come to pass because of me'.

Professor Kent dates the inscription "slightly before 350 B. C.; perhaps even earlier, though I doubt if it can go back to the second half of the fifth century, as Goldmann argues".

National Geographic Magazine—March, *The Land of Egypt*, Alfred Pearce Dennis [29 illustrations]. *Nuova Antologia*—April 21, *La Politica di Augusto et il suo Mausoleo*, Ettore Pais.

Quarterly Review—January, 1927, *Feminism in Greek Literature*, L. Arnold Post.

Revue des Questions Historiques—July, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne Grecque et Romaine*, Maurice Besnier.

Revue Historique—March, *Les Documents de l'Histoire Auguste et leur Valeur Historique*, Léon Homo.

—May, *Histoire Grecque, 1915-1922*, Paul Cloché. School and Society—April 3, *To Latin Via A Romance Language*, William D. Allen.—September 4, *The Greek Conception of the Aims of Education*, J. M. Hughes.

The School Review—March, Review, favorable, but brief, by Mima Maxey, of B. L. Ullman and N. E. Henry, *Second Latin Book*.

CHARLES KNAPP

## LONGFELLOW'S PSALM OF LIFE

Translated into Unelided Accentual Rhymed Latin Verse, After the Medieval Style

Tell me not, in mournful numbers,  
Life is but an empty dream!  
For the soul is dead that slumbers,  
And things are not what they seem.

Life is real! Life is earnest!  
And the grave is not its goal;  
"Dust thou art, to dust returnest"  
Was not spoken of the soul.

Not enjoyment and not sorrow  
Is our destined end or way:  
But to act that each tomorrow  
Finds us farther than today.

Art is long and Time is fleeting,  
And our hearts, though stout and brave,  
Still, like muffled drums, are beating  
Funeral marches to the grave.

In the world's broad field of battle,  
In the bivouac of Life,  
Be not like dumb, driven cattle!  
Be a hero in the strife!

Trust no Future, howe'er pleasant!  
Let the dead Past bury its dead!  
Act—act in the living Present!  
Heart within and God o'erhead.

Lives of great men all remind us  
We can make our lives sublime,  
And departing leave behind us  
Footprints on the sands of time,

Footprints, that perhaps another  
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,  
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,  
Seeing shall take heart again.

Let us then be up and doing,  
With a heart for any fate;  
Still achieving, still pursuing,  
Learn to labor and to wait.

Noli naeniis vocare  
vitam vana somnia;  
menti mors est dormire:  
visu fallunt omnia.

Viget vita, nisu plena,  
nec finitur funere.  
Non est anima terrena,  
nec celatur pulvere.

Nec voluptas neque luctus  
donum datur stabile;  
age, perge, nunc sit fructus  
maior cras quam hodie.

Ars est longa, fugax hora:  
corda, quamvis fortia,  
pulsu tacito sonora  
praecinunt funebria.

Per hanc vitam, sicut miles  
campo vel excubiis,  
temne pecudes serviles,  
pugna ritu Herculis!

Posterae ne luci crede!  
quidquid fuit, fuerit!  
Te praesenti penso dede!  
Deus—Virtus praesto sit!

Fortium virorum facta  
tradunt exemplaria:  
recte vita nos peracta  
linquimus vestigia,

quae si fixeris harenis,  
exspes forsan naufragus,  
rebus obrutus egenis,  
iam lustrabit hilarus.

Summis viribus agamus,  
nulla sorte territi:  
metam studio quaeramus:  
praestolemur impigri.

ARMSTRONG COLLEGE,  
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,  
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

J. WIGHT DUFF